

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/099,986	03/19/2002	Naoki Nakamura	112318	5624
25944 7	590 10/06/2003		EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			RAEVIS, ROBERT R	
P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Abbandan, vii basa			2856	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

10/099,986 NAKAMURA, NAO Examin r Robert R. Raevis 2856					
Robert R. Raevis 2856					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app ars on the cover sheet with the correspondence add Peri d for Reply	dress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this cor - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 August 2003</u>					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>6-10 and 16-20</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 11</u> is/are rejected.					
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2-5 and 12-15</u> is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examine	er.				
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.					
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
 Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National S application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 	Stage				
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional	application).				
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.	,				
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3. (A) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) 5) Notice of Informat Patent Application (PTO-948) (B) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/099,986

Art Unit: 2856

DETAILED ACTION

Election of Species Number 1 (corresponding to Figure 2) is acknowledged.

Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Muramatsu et al.

Muramatsu et al teach (Figure 6) a scanning probe microscope that includes a cantilever 1 having a probe; and a structural volume 20, 18, 19 that contains a sample 2 and liquid 15. The structural volume portion 18 includes a region that contacts the (upper) surface of the liquid. Muramatsu expressly refers to reducing "evaporation" (col. 6, line 10).

Art Unit: 2856

Muramatsu does not call the volume 20, 18, 19 a "sample container", and Figure 5 does not appear illustrate use of a light source and detector.

As to claims 1 and 11, the structural components 20, 18 and 19 may be properly classified a container, as it does contain both the sample and liquid. In addition, it would appear that Muramatsu's Figure 6 is simply a modification of Figure 3 (which employs a light source and detector), but if not, it would have been obvious to utilize a light source and detector in Figure 6 because Muramatsu teaches (Figure 3) use of light source and detector to accurately measure lever displacement of a scanning microscope.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Braunstein et al teach (col. 22, lines 42-45) use of a shroud to cover a sample to prevent liquid evaporation in microscopy.

Claims 2-5, 12-15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert R. Raevis whose telephone number is 703-305-4919. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 6:30 to 4:00pm. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

ROVID RAZVIS AUZ856